

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION**

DANIEL LOVELACE and)	
HELEN LOVELACE, Individually, and as)	
Parents of BRETT LOVELACE, deceased)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 2:13-cv-02289-SHL-dkv
)	
PEDIATRIC ANESTHESIOLOGISTS,)	
P.A.;)	
BABU RAO PAIDIPALLI; and,)	
MARK P. CLEMONS,)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE RESPONSE

Before the Court is Defendant Mark Clemons' Motion for Extension of Time to File Response to Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment. (ECF No. 137.) Clemons failed to file a response by the deadline, however, he did submit a response as an exhibit to the instant motion. (ECF No. 137-1.) Defendant Clemons filed this response approximately one week after the due date because his lawyers failed to see the ECF filing of the Motion for Partial Summary Judgment. This was sloppy lawyering, but it was a good faith mistake, and a response that is one week late will not delay the trial or unfairly impact the Plaintiffs. Therefore, the Motion for Extension of Time to File Response is GRANTED. The Court hereby accepts the Response filed as exhibit 1 to the Motion for Extension of Time (ECF No. 137-1) and as a separate document (ECF No. 138) as Defendant's Response to Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment. Plaintiff's Motion to Strike is MOOT because the reply is no longer relevant.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this 23rd day of October, 2014.

/s/ Sheryl H. Lipman

Sheryl H. Lipman

U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE